

### REMARKS

Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, and 62-71 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 43, 45-47, 52-54, 56, 59-60, 62, and 65-66 have been amended as shown on pp. 3-6 of the Reply. Claims 44, 48-51, 55, 57-58, and 61 are canceled. New claims 69-71 are added. No new matter has been added. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on p. 2.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

#### **I. Objection to Claims 43 and 47**

Claims 43 and 47 are objected to because of informalities. This rejection should be withdrawn in view of the amendments to claims 43 and 47 made herein.

For example, in light of Examiner's suggestion to replace "via" with "to" on line 7 of claim 43, amended independent claim 43 now recites *the at least one wireless access point is configured to service the call to the digital cordless handset utilizing an IEEE 802.11b wireless connection, and wherein the call is serviceable via the cellular telephone using a cellular connection*. Further, in light of Examiner's suggestion to insert "an" after "with" on line 2 of claim 47, amended dependent claim 47 now recites *the digital cordless handset is associated with an identification information transferred from a wireless network to the data network*.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

#### **II. Rejection of Claims 45 and 46 Under 35 U.S.C § 112**

Claims 45 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection should be withdrawn in view of the amendments to claim 45 and 46 made herein.

For example, amended dependent claim 45 now recites *the call is switched between at least one other wireless access point and the at least one wireless access point*; and amended dependent claim 46 now recites *the call is serviced via the data network utilizing a first wireless transmission area and a second wireless transmission area*. Support for such amendments can

be found in Assignee's specification at least at paragraph [0036], which describes "[d]uring use, **the digital cordless handset 104 may move from an area serviced by one wireless access point 215 to an area serviced by another wireless access point.** For example, a user may be using the handset 104 through the BRG 206 at home and then travel to a shopping center where the handset 104 operates through the wireless access point 215. **This transition may be seamless by the use of conventional hand-off procedures** where the two areas are not separated by a dead zone lacking adequate signal. Thus, **the wired data network portion 208 detects the presence of the cordless handset 104 in one area as reported by the wireless access point for that area and then detects the presence of the cordless handset 104 in another area...The VoIP and IP communications with the handset 104 may then continue in the new area by routing packets accordingly.**"

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

### **III. Rejection of Claims 43, 45-46, 52, 54, 56, and 63-66 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 43, 45-46, 52, 54, 56, and 63-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.* (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0141484) and Pinard *et al.* (US Patent No. 5,454,032). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rogalski *et al.* and Pinard *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

The subject application generally relates to providing services to wireless devices via wireless access points. Aspects of the subject application can include assigning a single telephone number to two or more handsets, each of which may be operated in a different telecommunications network. For example, when a call is initiated to the single telephone number, both a handset operable for use with an IEEE 802.11b wireless network and a handset operable for use with a cellular network can be rung. Either handset may then be used to receive the call. (See *e.g.* the subject application at paragraph [0053]). To these and other related ends, independent claim 43, as amended, recites *at least one wireless access point coupled to a services node of a data network, wherein **the services node is configured to initiate a call to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone based on a termination trigger generated via the data network.*** (See *e.g.* the subject application at paragraphs [0065] – [0066]).

Rogalski *et al.* generally relates to providing wireless communications between a cellular telephone and a landline telephone utilizing Bluetooth. (See Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0021]); and Pinard *et al.* generally relates to associating a single directory number with different kinds of peripheral devices (see Pinard *et al.* at col. 1, lines 7-12); however, neither Rogalski *et al.* nor Pinard *et al.* teach or suggest at least the following, as recited in claim 43: *at least one wireless access point coupled to a services node of a data network, wherein **the services node is configured to initiate a call to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone based on a termination trigger generated via the data network.*** Rather, Rogalski *et al.* merely discloses a cellular telephone in communication with a cordless telephone base station including a Bluetooth transceiver (see Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0011]); and Pinard *et al.* merely discloses a main controller accesses circuit descriptors of telephone sets and requests peripheral circuits associated with the telephone sets to be seized. (See Pinard *et al.* at col. 4, lines 13-19).

Independent claim 52, as amended, recites ***initiating a call to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone via a services node coupled to a data network based on a termination trigger generated via the data network.*** In this regard, at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 43 apply similarly to claim 52, and thus claim 52 is patentable for at least the same reasons.

Further, the Final Office Action concedes that Rogalski *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 45; and Pinard *et al.* fails to remedy the deficiency of Rogalski *et al.* in that Pinard *et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least ***the call is switched between at least one other wireless access point and the at least one wireless access point,*** as recited in amended dependent claim 45. Instead, Pinard *et al.* merely discloses releasing a line circuit that has not gone off-hook. (See Pinard *et al.* at col. 4, lines 29-30).

Furthermore, the Final Office Action concedes that Rogalski *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 46; and Pinard *et al.* fails to remedy the deficiency of Rogalski *et al.* in that Pinard *et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least ***the call is serviced via the data network utilizing a first wireless transmission area and a second wireless transmission area,*** as recited in amended dependent claim 46. Rather, Pinard *et al.* merely discloses ringing two telephone sets using a single directory number. (See Pinard *et al.* at col. 1, lines 55-58; col. 4, lines 24-26).

Accordingly, Rogalski *et al.* and Pinard *et al.* fail to teach or suggest each and every

element of claims 43, 45-46, 52, 54, 56, and 63-66, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 47 and 53 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 47 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Rogalski *et al.*, Pinard *et al.*, and Kallio (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0147008). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rogalski *et al.*, Pinard *et al.*, and Kallio, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

Rogalski *et al.* generally relates to providing wireless communications between a cellular telephone and a landline telephone utilizing Bluetooth (*see* Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0021]); Pinard *et al.* generally relates to associating a single directory number with different kinds of peripheral devices (*see* Pinard *et al.* at col. 1, lines 7-12); and Kallio is generally directed to a dual-mode device that can roam between a Global System for Mobile communication (GSM) network and a wireless local area network (WLAN) (*see* Kallio at paragraph [0025]); however, Kallio does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rogalski *et al.* and Pinard *et al.* regarding amended independent claim 43, as Kallio fails to teach or suggest *at least one wireless access point coupled to a services node of a data network, wherein **the services node is configured to initiate a call to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone based on a termination trigger generated via the data network.*** Further, Kallio does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rogalski *et al.* and Pinard *et al.* regarding amended independent claim 52, as Kallio fails to teach or suggest at least ***initiating a call to a digital cordless handset and a cellular telephone via a services node coupled to a data network based on a termination trigger generated via the data network.***

Accordingly, claims 47 and 53 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 43 and 52 set forth above, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 59 and 67-68 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 59 and 67-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kallio and Pinard *et al.* This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Kallio and Pinard *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

Independent claim 59, as amended, recites *the services node is configured to initiate a call to a cordless handset and a cellular telephone based on a termination trigger generated within the data network*. In this regard, at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claims 43 and 52 apply similarly to claim 59, and thus claim 59 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

**VI. Rejection of Claims 60 and 62 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 60 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Kallio, Pinard *et al.*, and Jones *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,404,764). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Kallio, Pinard *et al.*, and Jones *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 60 and 62.

The Final Office Action concedes that Kallio and Pinard *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 60 and 62; and Jones *et al.* fails to remedy the deficiency of Kallio and Pinard *et al.* in that Jones *et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least *the services node is configured to initiate a call to a cordless handset and a cellular telephone based on a termination trigger generated within the data network*, as recited in amended independent claim 59. Accordingly, claims 60 and 62 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 59 set forth above, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

**VII. New Claims 69-71**

Claims 69-71 are newly presented and present additional elements that patentably define over the cited art. For instance, new claim 69 recites *a service control point configured to query, based on the termination trigger, whether a database includes subscriber information associated with the call, wherein the services node is further configured to initiate the call to the*

*digital cordless handset and the cellular telephone based on the subscriber information.* Further, new claim 70 similarly recites ***querying, via a service control point, subscriber information in response to the termination trigger***; and routing the call to the services node based on the subscriber information, wherein the initiating further includes initiating the call to the digital cordless handset and the cellular telephone based on the subscriber information. Furthermore, new claim 71 similarly recites ***obtaining, via a service control point, subscriber information based on the termination trigger***, wherein the services node is further configured to initiate the call based on the subscriber information. In contrast, primary reference Rogalski *et al.* discloses a cellular telephone in communication with a cordless telephone base station including a Bluetooth transceiver (*see* Rogalski *et al.* at paragraph [0011]). Neither Kallio, Pinard *et al.*, nor Jones *et al.* cure the deficiency of Rogalski *et al.* with respect to claims 69-71.

### **CONCLUSION**

Assignee's representative submits this Reply addresses all of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [ATTWP290USB].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Assignee's undersigned representative at (216) 696-8730.

Respectfully submitted,

TUROC & WATSON, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/

Keith E. Drabek

Reg. No. 60,757

AT&T Legal Department – T&W  
Attn: Patent Docketing  
Room 2A-207  
One AT&T Way  
Bedminster, NJ 07921